



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In matters outside of church history there are many errors and misjudgments: Philip of Swabia is spoken of as "usurping his nephew's inheritance" (p. 290); the rights of Magna Carta come "down from old Teutonic customs and precedents" (p. 319); Simon de Montfort "laid the foundations of a free English Parliament" (p. 352); "It was a principle of Magna Charta that the crown could not raise taxes without the consent of Parliament" (p. 398).

A. B. WHITE.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by LORD ACTON, LL.D. Edited by A. W. WARD, G. W. PROTHERO, STANLEY LEATHES. In twelve volumes. Volume I. The Renaissance. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. xxx, 807.)

THE first volume of the *Cambridge Modern History* was awaited with much interest, and has been accepted on all sides with evidences of high appreciation. It is truly a work of great compass and erudition. Six hundred and ninety-two pages of text, the contributions in many instances of men of international reputation and acknowledged merit, supplemented with one hundred pages of classified bibliography, are a notable addition to the literature of the Renaissance. We shall be willing to admit, at the outset, that the work has been carefully and accurately done. The most unfavorable judgment that could be rendered would still pronounce it an extensive and valuable collection of material for the better understanding of the Renaissance period; the most favorable view would regard it as a triumph of the art of coöperative historical writing.

The first instalment of the *Cambridge Modern History* comes to hand at a time when much interest is being felt in this subject of coöperative writing; when the results of several enterprises in the past have left the impression that success has yet to be achieved, and the announcements of various projects for the future have given notice that the effort is to be continued under more promising conditions. The editors, in their preface, and Dr. Creighton, in the introductory chapter, have frankly set forth the dangers and advantages of the coöperative plan. On the one hand, the difficulty of bringing the individual contributors into a scheme of harmonious development, and of preserving a just proportion in the arrangement of the several parts, together with the dangers of omission and of duplication, are serious obstacles to be overcome. Against this we have the manifest advantages of a subdivision of labor, with all that this implies, the enthusiasm of specialists, their accuracy, and a certain freshness of style and vigor of touch which comes from an intimate acquaintance with the facts at the outset of the enterprise.

The question arises, how far have the editors succeeded in overcoming the difficulties which have been enumerated? That they have secured many if not all of the advantages claimed for the system is evident. The editors modestly avow their belief "that the present work may, without presumption, aim higher than its predecessors, and may seek to be something more than a useful compilation or than a standard work of reference," that it may be "a narrative which is not a mere

string of episodes, but display a continuous development." Such a consummation would imply, no doubt, the arrival at the point proposed by the coöperative plan. It could be achieved only by a triumph of editorship, such a control and disposition of the coöperating forces as would ensure the welding of the component parts into a complete and harmonious whole. That this has been accomplished we may be permitted to doubt ; that a substantial step has been taken in the direction of the realization of the ideal may be admitted. In many earlier series the function of the editorial body has been limited to the selection of contributors, a formal apportionment of the work, and a general censorial supervision. The success of coöperative editing, if it shall ever become an unqualified success, demands something more than this. It demands an editorial activity of the most positive sort, a central power to whose judgment the contributors shall yield, not in questions of historical fact, but on all points relating to the disposition and correlation of material. Such editors, it is hardly necessary to say, are rare. The late Lord Acton, by whom the plan of the *Cambridge Modern History* was "conceived and mapped out," was, by all accounts, such a man. His untimely death, before the task of weaving the several threads of narrative into the fabric he had designed had been fairly begun, was a serious blow, and has left us without means to arrive at a knowledge of the measure of perfection to which the project, in his hands, might have been brought. That his successors have attained to so high a point of success, in what must have been in many respects an ungrateful task, speaks highly for their editorial ability.

In measuring the advance that has been made by the Cambridge volume along the line of coöperative editing, we naturally turn to institute a comparison with two other great series which have attempted to deal in a somewhat similar manner with periods of history more or less parallel. These are the "Oncken series," generally so designated, and the *Histoire Générale*. Of the three sets the *Cambridge Modern History* is by far the most comprehensive. In the Oncken series the whole subject of the Renaissance was assigned to a well-known authority, Ludwig Geiger ; in the *Histoire Générale*, where the division of labor more nearly approaches the method of the Cambridge series, the list of contributors includes men whose interest in the main subject is well recognized, as, for example, M. Gebhart, and in the domain of art, MM. Michel and Lavoix. It is a curious fact that of all the contributors to the volume under examination not one has ever been especially associated with the subject of the Renaissance, if we except Mr. Horatio Brown, who is a recognized authority on Venetian history. If it were the purpose of the projectors to prepare a collection of monographs with a view of supplementing our knowledge of the Renaissance, this selection of contributors might prove to be a positive advantage, importing into the accumulated discussion of the subject a certain freshness of view, which would afford an acceptable enlargement of the conventional treatment of the subject. In a history of the Renaissance, however, intended to

be complete in itself, and committed to a scheme of "continuous development," the method is, perhaps, open to criticism.

The work of Ludwig Geiger differs from the present volume in other vital respects. It includes a discussion of the art of the Renaissance, as, indeed, does the *Histoire Générale*; but it is of additional value from the fact that it is abundantly furnished with illustrations, selected in accordance with the severest canons that govern the illustration of historical books. The editors of the Cambridge series stopped short of this, regarding it as an extension of the scope of the work, "which considerations of space compel us to renounce." It is, to say the least, a misfortune that such considerations compelled them to forego the advantage which might have been conserved by the use of maps. It seems late in the day for a great work of general interest to deprive its readers of those additional means of acquiring information that recent invention has made so easily available. Those who use the Cambridge series—and they are likely to be many—will regret that a moderate amount of illustration was not provided for by a curtailment of an immoderate amount of political information.

If we compare the text of the Cambridge *Renaissance* with the text devoted to the same period in the *Histoire Générale*, it will be evident that the former excels greatly in the volume of its facts, the latter in the coördination of facts and in the suggestiveness of its conclusions. In the Cambridge volume a conscientious effort has been made to collect, under the topics treated, all the important facts that are at hand. The *Histoire Générale* is more economical and more discriminating in its selection, while the individuality of the contributor's point of view and the ripeness of his judgment are particularly grateful to the student. Indeed, it seems the habit of the Cambridge book, a habit which it possesses in common with many German historical works, to collect and present the facts, permitting the reader to draw his own generalizations. The French, on the other hand, coördinate the facts, evolve the general idea, which they illustrate with selected instances. Both methods have their merits, and the selection of one or the other will depend upon the class of readers for whose benefit the work is planned.

The arrangement of topics in the Cambridge volume is likely to excite surprise and elicit a variety of opinions. The editors assert that they are not to be tied by the necessities of chronological sequence. No objection can be urged against this determination, provided that the chronological arrangement gives way to something more useful. The usual method of presenting the subject in books on the Renaissance has been somewhat as follows: first, a general review of the political and social conditions of the times; second, the development of what might be termed the spirit of the Renaissance, usually defined in periods of progression; third, the application of this spirit of the Renaissance to the problems and affairs of human life and activity. This is the course which, in a general way, has been pursued by Symonds, Burckhardt, and Villari. It has no special sanction otherwise, and might be set aside at

any time for something better. The Cambridge editors have established a new arrangement. On opening the book the reader is surprised to find Chapters I. and II. devoted respectively to "The Age of Discovery" and "The New World," narrating events which took place at a time when, according to the conventional view of the period, the Renaissance was drawing to a close. Putting chronology aside, it is difficult to conceive of any method of topical treatment that justifies the location, in advance of a discussion of the manner in which the Renaissance spirit arose and became influential, of events that must be regarded as a product of this spirit.

The proportions of the work differ materially from other histories of the Renaissance in the relatively large space given to political history, fourteen out of the nineteen chapters of the book. Of the remaining chapters, Chapter XVI., "The Classical Renaissance," by Professor Jebb; Chapter XVII., "The Christian Renaissance," by Dr. M. R. James; and Chapter XVIII., "Catholic Europe," by Dr. William Barry, in all 120 pages, cover that portion of the work which might be described as treating of the rise and progress of the spirit of the Renaissance. Chapter XV., by Dr. Cunningham, is devoted to "Economic Change," and Chapter XIX., by Mr. Lea, is entitled "The Eve of the Reformation." This overweighting on the side of political history, to the detriment of the intellectual, the social, and the economic, is accounted for by the editors in the statement that the "first volume is not merely intended to describe and discuss the Renaissance . . . but is also designed as an introductory volume, whose business it is, as it were, to bring upon the stage the nations, forces, and interests which will bear the chief parts in the action" (*i. e.* of the series at large). It may be doubted, however, if this sad necessity wholly accounts for the disproportion. Much might be attributed to the insatiable thirst for political facts that is characteristic of the gentlemen in charge of the enterprise, and to their indifference to the more succulent parts of the story of mankind — predilections which have been shown more than once in recent English historical publications, notably in the arid stretches of the "Periods of European History."

The subject of proportion leads to the final query as to whether the volume fairly represents the whole range of interests associated with the Renaissance. "Politics, economics, and social life" are indicated as the chief concern of the series; art and literature are consciously relegated to separate and special works. The reader will soon find, however, that politics has really succeeded in crowding his associates from the tent. Economics, as represented in a chapter of fifty pages, has the advantage of an exceptionally able interpreter in Dr. Cunningham. So far as social history is concerned, no special chapters are devoted to the subject. It is woven, to be sure a meager thread, throughout the chapters on Italy and Spain: a few pages in Mr. Armstrong's chapter on "Florence: Savonarola" (V.); a brief mention of the life of the people in Dr. Brown's "Venice" (VIII.), in Mr. Burd's "Florence: Machiavelli" (VI.), in Dr. Garnett's "Rome and the Temporal Power" (VII.), and

in Professor Tout's "Germany and the Empire" (IX.) ; in Mr. Leathes's "France" (XII.), and in Dr. Ward's "The Netherlands" (XIII.) something more. Any effort to depict the life and sentiments of the Italian middle class, such as suggested by Burckhardt in his use of Alberti's *Trattato del Governo della Famiglia*, so important for correcting our estimate of Renaissance morality, is wholly wanting. In his "Germany and the Empire" Professor Tout devotes a page (299) to the classes of society in Germany, but his main interest is in the effort for the reform of the imperial administration, which is especially well set forth.

It would be easy to suggest the addition of special chapters the absence of which is a serious limitation. A chapter on the art of war, describing the Condottieri, the rise of the Swiss infantry, the organization of the Lansquenets, the superiority of the Spanish armament, and the suggestions of Machiavelli for the organization of a Florentine militia, would have been in order. More important still would be a chapter on education in the Renaissance. Professor Jebb in Chapter XVI. has spoken briefly of Vittorino da Feltre and Guarino ; but the development of a popular educational system in Germany, to which Janssen has so forcibly called our attention, has no representation, although abundant material is at hand in the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* (to mention one source), for the universities, and in the student autobiographies of the period, for the public schools.

The religious side of the Renaissance is well provided for. Dr. Barry, whose *Papal Monarchy* has been so well received, was a happy selection. In his chapter on "Catholic Europe" (XVIII.) he discusses the attitude of the Church toward the humanistic movement. It is a harbinger of the golden age of historical writing when we discover theological lions and lambs lying down together with impunity. Mr. Lea follows, and brings the book to a conclusion with a chapter entitled "The Eve of the Reformation" (XIX.). Mr. Lea's chapter, although filled with the results of that scholarly research which has won for the author first place in the ranks of living American historians, is disappointing to the student of the Renaissance. It is primarily concerned with the organization of the sixteenth-century church, and only incidentally with the attitude of the humanists toward the religious questions of the day. Of the forty pages which make up the chapter thirty are devoted to the evils of the Church. Of the value of this description opinions will differ. No one will doubt the accuracy of Mr. Lea's facts, but many will be inclined to question the correctness of the impression which the disposition of these facts produces upon the reader. The lurid picture of the vices of the papal court leaves it to be inferred that these vices were something inseparably connected with the clerical garb, and not the equally common attribute of all persons whose social eminence gave them the opportunity for indulgence. There is nothing here that suggests the opinion of Nicholas de Clemanges, himself a sharp critic of the abuses of the Church, when he remarks that, while there is much to condemn in

the papal court, yet, having a fair experience of many temporal courts, he can say that the papal court is the cleanest he has ever seen.

MERRICK WHITCOMB.

Histoire de France depuis les Origines jusqu' à la Révolution. (Publiée sous la Direction de M. Ernest Lavisse.) Tome V. Les Guerres d'Italie. La France sous Charles VIII, Louis XII et François I^{er} (1492-1547). Par HENRY LEMONNIER, Professeur à l'Université de Paris. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1903. Pp. 394.)

M. LEMONNIER has had a formidable task in writing the history of the reign of Louis XII. and Francis I., for aside from the complexity of the period, there are other real difficulties. Natures like that of Francis I., of Louise of Savoy, of Marguerite d'Angoulême, of the constable Bourbon are not easily estimated; the psychological element is large, the personal equation a very variable one. Then again, the difficulties attending a knowledge of the sources is great. One may reasonably hope to consult almost all the sources pertaining to most medieval themes. But it is not so with reference to a subject in a modern epoch, for the mass of materials is too voluminous. And in the history of the sixteenth century this difficulty is enhanced in two particulars. In the first place, the sources of the period are widely dispersed. Little care was then taken in France to preserve records, save in the case of the registers of the *parlements*. Each minister of state, each ambassador or other official guarded his own correspondence and disposed of it as he chose. Thus L'Aubespine, the bishop of Limoges, who was Catherine de Medici's ambassador to the court of Philip II., carried the correspondence of his office with him from point to point, and when the Spanish king returned to Spain in 1559 all these documents were lost by shipwreck. It was the administration of Richelieu which inaugurated the change by which documents of state and the doubles of correspondence were preserved in various *dépôts*. The mass of materials comprised in the *Fonds français* of the Bibliothèque Nationale and at the Archives Nationales, and the Collection Godefroy in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut has reduced the difficulties of the historian of the sixteenth century to a great degree. Yet it still remains true that, more than in almost any other period, the sources of the history of France in this period are scattered. Aside from the familiar seats of research in France and other countries, foreign archives more remote require to be visited. In Cracow are unpublished materials pertaining to Henry of Anjou's short and absurd reign as king of Poland; and nearer home, the archives in Besançon and the manuscripts in the Musée Condé at Chantilly must not be overlooked.

Still another embarrassment arises from the unsettled form of the language. The French language experienced a great expansion at this time, owing to the influence of the Renaissance, while as yet there were few settled rules of orthography. Moreover, it was exposed to an invasion of foreign words, especially Italian and Spanish, in consequence of which influences the historian of the sixteenth century cannot read the sources.